REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Supplemental Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action dated April 18, 2007. Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 11-15, 18, 19, 21, and 23-30 are pending. Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 11-15, 18, 19, 21, and 23-30 are rejected. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 14, 18, 19, and 26 have been amended. Claims 1, 11, 12, 13, 23, 24, 25, 29, and 30 have been canceled. Claims 31-33 have been added. Accordingly, claims 2-3, 6-7, 9, 14-15, 18-19, 21, 26-28, and 31-33 remain pending in the present application.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's interview on September 18, 2007. Applicant accordingly submits this supplemental amendment.

Independent claims 1, 13, and 25 have been canceled. New independent claims 31-33 have been added. Claims 2, 3, 6-7, 14, 18-19, and 26 have been amended to depend upon and be consistent with the new independent claims 31-33.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-3, 6, 10, 13-15, 18, and 22 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Sharma et al (US 2003/0204645; hereinafter Sharma). Claims 7, 11, 12, 19, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma as applied to claims 6 and 18 above, and further in view of Chiang et al. (US 6,948,174; hereinafter Chiang). Claims 10 and 22 had been canceled in previous amendments. Claims 1, 7, 12, 13, 23, and 24 have been canceled. Their rejections are thus moot. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejections per the new and remaining claims.

Chiang discloses a Common Application Metamodel (CAM) tool, method, and

system for providing a data transformer that is bi-directional between a client application and a server application. At least one connector exists between the end user application and the application server. The application request from the first language of the first end user application is converted to the language running on the application server. The response to the application request is converted from the language running on the application server to the first language of the first end user application. (Col. 3, line 44 – col. 4, line 12) Figure 8 of Chiang illustrates the application of the CAM during run time, where SOAP compliant XML document 803 are received in a middleware 805, which is in contact with an XML repository 809, containing the XML instance files for the CAM model. Here, CAM facilitates connectivity between the back-end IMS application 815 and the web file 803. The CAM accomplishes this by using CAM model information to perform data transformations from one platform to another in the mixed language environment shown. (Col. 11, lines 18-46)

In contrast, the invention addresses the situation where multiple client applications access respective data sources that are stored in different formats and are not directly accessible by the other client applications. Accessibility is provided by storing data from the respective data sources in a database at a server in a manner where the data is standardized. The invention provides this standardized data by providing an adapter API at each of the client applications that provides a first set of methods for the client applications to use to translate data in the respective data sources into XML format, and modifying each of the client applications to invoke the first set of methods in the adapter API to convert the data in the respective data sources into XML format according to a registered schema definition and saving the XML format data from the respective data sources in XML files. Each of the XML files is then submitted to an import repository at the server. Each of the XML files in the import repository are validated against a document

type definition (DTD) corresponding to the respective data sources. The validated XML files are parsed, and name/value pairs are stored in the database at the server according to a hierarchy specified by the corresponding DTD. Thus, the XML files are collected and validated in the import repository before being stored in the database.

The collecting of the XML files in the import repository provides the following advantages: 1) it provides a separate collection of XML files to ensure that data sources can be completely validated and recorded before entering the database; 2) a separate staging area keeps the XML files in isolation of the operational database, and hence minimizes the impact on the integrated data warehouse (if things go wrong); and a separate staging area for a client applications provides an ability to track transactions independent of the database. (See specification at p. 17, lines 14-23) Because the XML files are provided and validated in the import repository in the claimed manner, prior to being stored in the database, true standardization of the data from the data sources is provided.

Chiang discloses using the XML file to convert languages between a user application and a server. Although Chiang discloses the use of an XML file, Chiang is concerned with a user application and a server being able to communicate, not the standardization of data from multiple data sources in different formats at a database. Chiang does not teach or suggest how to collect, validate, parse, or store XML files from multiple data sources in different formats, such that the standardization of data from the data sources is provided across user applications. Even assuming that multiple user applications can communicate with the server as disclosed by Chiang, this only teaches how each individual user application can communicate with the same server. This is not a teaching of how the data from these multiple user applications are truly standardized for access by each other.

Sharma in view of Chiang thus fails to teach or suggest modifying each of the client applications to invoke the first set of methods in the adapter API to convert the data in the respective data sources into XML format according to a registered schema definition and saving the XML format data from the respective data sources in XML files, submitting each of the XML files to an import repository at a server, validating each of the XML files in the import repository against a DTD corresponding to the respective data sources, and parsing the validated XML files in the import repository and storing name/value pairs in a database at the server according to a hierarchy specified by the corresponding DTD, thereby standardizing the data from the data sources, as recited in amended independent claims 31, 32, and 33.

Claims 31-33 are thus allowable over Sharma in view of Chiang.

Applicant submits that claims 2-3, 6-7, 14-15, and 18-19 are allowable because they depend on the allowable base claims 31-33.

Claims 9, 21, and 25-30 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma in view of Chiang as applied to claims 7 and 19 above, and further in view of Fry (US 6,880,125). Claims 25, 29, and 30 have been canceled. Their rejections are thus moot.

Claims 9, 21, and 26-28 depend upon new independent claims 31-33. Applicant submits that claims 31-33 are allowable for the reasons set forth above. Applicant further submits claims 9, 21, and 26-28 are allowable because they depend on these allowable base claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 2-3, 6-7, 9, 14-15, 18-19, 21, 26-28, and 31-33 are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and passage to issue of these claims as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any

unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone

number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen G. Sullivan/
Stephen G. Sullivan
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38329
Telephone No.: 650 969-7474

Date: September 26, 2007